

# EXHIBIT L

1           IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2           FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

3       IN RE: PROCESSED EGG PRODUCTS : MDL No. 2002  
4       ANTITRUST LITIGATION           : No. 08-MD-02002

5       -----:  
6       THIS DOCUMENT APPLIES TO:      :  
7       ALL ACTIONS                    :  
8       -----

9       IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF WYANDOTTE COUNTY, KANSAS  
10           TWENTY-NINTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

11       ASSOCIATED WHOLESALE GROCERS,   : Case No.  
12       INC., et al.,                   : 10-cv-2171  
13           Plaintiffs,                :  
14           v.                         :  
15       UNITED EGG PRODUCERS, et al., :  
16           Defendants.               :

17                                        \*\* HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL \*\*

18                                        Friday, April 18, 2014

19                                        Videotaped 30(b)(6) deposition  
20                                        of Food Marketing Institute, through JILL  
21                                        HOLLINGSWORTH, DVM, taken at the offices of  
22                                        Pepper Hamilton LLP, 600 Fourteenth Street,  
23                                        N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005, beginning at  
24                                        9:11 a.m., before LINDA ROSSI RIOS, a  
25                                        Federally Approved RPR, CCR and Notary  
  Public.

332

1 JILL HOLLINGSWORTH, DVM - HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL  
2 individuals coming up with best practices  
3 that were not based on science, but rather  
4 pushed by such things as activist groups.

5 Q. You consider that to be  
6 market-driven competition?

7 MR. WILDERS: Objection. Asked  
8 and answered.

9 THE WITNESS: We considered the  
10 situation between companies like  
11 McDonald's and Burger King to be  
12 driven and pressure put on them to do  
13 something because PETA asked for it  
14 rather than what was based on science.

15 BY MR. DAVIS:

16 Q. Did FMI and its members think  
17 that by working with NCCR, they could help to  
18 avoid being dragged into a similar situation?

19 A. We felt that --

20 MR. WILDERS: Objection. Calls  
21 for speculation.

22 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.

23 BY MR. DAVIS:

24 Q. You can go ahead.

25 A. We felt that there was a

333

1 JILL HOLLINGSWORTH, DVM - HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL  
2 collaborative approach, that it was to  
3 everyone's benefit to identify universally  
4 what were the best scientific best practices.

5 Q. But I'm asking, this reference  
6 is specifically FMI joining its efforts with  
7 NCCR, and lists these as advantages. So is  
8 that an advantage of FMI joining its efforts  
9 with NCCR?

10 A. In the sense that, yes, we felt  
11 that if food service restaurants and  
12 retailers were all working together, then it  
13 was good for the entire food supply chain.  
14 It was FMI's members and NCCR's members who  
15 would all benefit from having an agreed upon  
16 what is best practices.

17 Q. Would it also at all result in  
18 FMI's members sharing in the cost of animal  
19 welfare?

20 MR. WILDERS: Objection. Lacks  
21 foundation. Calls for speculation.

22 THE WITNESS: I'm not  
23 understanding. The cost to FMI?

24 BY MR. DAVIS:

25 Q. Did FMI's members ever express